

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 9, 2012

AGENDA

NEW ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM CASE

- 1. Dance Extension
12-045CU
(Approved 7 – 0)**

**4400 Tuller Road
Conditional Use**

NEW CASES

- 2. Stansbury at Muirfield
12-043INF
(Discussion)**

**10799 Drake Road
Informal Review**

- 3. Ohio Health Campus, Subarea 2 – Ohio Health Urgent Care & Dublin Health Center
12-041Z/PDP/FDP
(Tabled 6 – 0)**

**6905 and 6955 Hospital Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan**

- 4. Community Plan 2012 Amendment
12-046ADM
(Presentation)**

Administrative Request

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Victoria Newell, Warren Fishman, Joe Budde, and John Hardt. City representatives were Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Gary Gunderman, Justin Goodwin, Aaron Stanford, Alan Perkins, Jonathan Lee, Sharonda Whatley, Tori Proehl, Katherine Sims, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the July 12, 2012 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the July 19, 2012 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Claudia Husak pointed out that included in the Newsletter were the Administrative Review Team Items that are either pending or have been through the process with a link to the City website where the materials are located. She said as part of the Summary Actions from the Administrative Review Team, a

link to the City website was sent, and moving forward all the Board and Commission liaisons will be doing that so that if interested, anyone can see the documents.

Ms. Husak said Planning has been working with IT to assign the Commissioners City of Dublin email addresses. She said it would be something positive if they wanted to keep their Commission work separate from their personal or business work. She said if there were ever a records request, it would be focused on their city email address. She said City of Dublin emails can be accessed through the Internet as a regular web browser, or if they have an iPhone or iPad, they could also access them through that technology. Ms. Husak she would send an email reminding them to send their middle initials to either her or Flora Rogers. She said in the next packet or at the next meeting, instructions will be provided on how to get to the email and she will send a couple of tests to them.

Ms. Husak thanked Ms. Amorose Groomes for her time and effort helping Planning with the electronic packet project. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she had brought the paper documents as backup to her iPad tonight.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the applications for Cases 1 and 3 were consent items. She said that Mr. Hardt had requested that Case 3 be pulled for comments or questions. She announced that the cases would be heard in the order of the published agenda. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Commission.

1. Dance Extension 12-045CU

4400 Tuller Road Conditional Use

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this request for review and approval of this conditional use application for a 6,760-square-foot dance studio within an existing building on the north side of Tuller Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of the intersection with Riverside Drive. She swore in City representatives intending to address the Commission on this consent case. Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that the neither the applicant nor representative were present but there were no conditions that needed their agreement. She invited public and Commissioner comments regarding this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Conditional Use application because it meets the review criteria of the Zoning Code and the development standards within the area with no conditions. Ms. Newell seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

2. Stansbury at Muirfield 12-043INF

10799 Drake Road Informal Review

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this request for informal review and non-binding feedback for a development of an 11.5-acre site with 24 residential lots as a new Planned Unit Development located on the east side of Drake Road, approximately 200 feet south of the intersection with Springburn Drive.

Richard Taylor recused himself from this case due to a conflict of interest because he is an employee of the Muirfield Association and a member of the Muirfield Design Review Committee.

Claudia Husak presented this request for informal review and feedback. She said the site is located south of Glick Road and north of Carnoustie Drive, accessed by Drake Road. She showed a photograph of the site surrounded by single-family Muirfield Village residences in all directions, which were platted in the late 70s and developed in the early to mid 80s. She said a vacant house and several outbuildings are located on the site. Ms. Husak said City maps show two forks of a stream located within the boundaries of the site that have not been studied as far as the width or depth. She said a Stream Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ) overlays the two forks of the stream. Ms. Husak said the intention of the SCPZ is to preserve any floodwater capacity of existing drainage ways and the width has to be determined by studying the area. She said if the applicant were to move forward, that is information that needs to be submitted as part of a Preliminary Development Plan.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant has provided a site analysis indicating where undeveloped open spaces are located, showing where significant green spaces are, and showing a 100-foot minimum clear area around a certain area of the SCPZ, but not on the southern fork. She said at this point, it would not meet Dublin's SCPZ requirements, and any disturbance of natural vegetation with buildings or stormwater management would not be permitted unless the applicant submits a study and receives a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Husak said what the applicant is proposing would result in a density of two units per acre. She said according to the data provided, large portions of the site totaling 52 percent are proposed to be preserved as open space. She said the development statement provided by the applicant to the Commission explains the intended market for the houses as well as the type of home to be built on these lots. She presented a plan with one cul-de-sac type street from Drake Road with open areas in the center of a cul-de-sac to the east and a reserve loop area in the center of the site with lots on both ends of them. Ms. Husak said that the Fire and Engineering departments have concerns about the road layout and will work with the applicant in the future to ensure that all the roadway geometry would be adequate for vehicles to turn, stop, and make movements around intersections and the cul-de-sac areas.

Ms. Husak said also for the site, there is a proposal for an open rear yard, which has not yet been defined and then larger open spaces around the perimeter of the site, keeping the lots a little smaller, but through the design allowing larger setbacks around the perimeter and the against existing homes.

Ms. Husak said a scaled plan had not been submitted, so the lot size cannot be determined. She said however, they are comparable from what surrounds the site. She said that Planning wants to ensure that there is adequate space to accommodate the large homes as well as outdoor living spaces, such as patios, decks, or fireplaces. Ms. Husak said that Planning would want the applicant to move forward with layout changes to the environmental concerns as far as tree preservation and the Stream Corridor Protection Zone. She pointed out that in the center of the site there is definitely room to open it up and cluster the lots more to either end.

Ms. Husak said the 2007 Community Plan shows this site as Low Density, one-half to one-unit per acre. She said all the surrounding area is shown as medium density or high density. She said the lot sizes here are similar to those surrounding the site. She said the current zoning for the site is R, Rural District, which would require approximately 40,000 square feet for a lot to develop on the site, depending upon how much right-of-way would be required, it would potentially be eight to 11 units per acre on this site. She said the applicant is looking at a density higher than the Community Plan suggests and the existing zoning on this site permits. Ms. Husak explained that the site was zoned in 2003 as R, Rural District, with the idea that the owner at the time wanted to retain some allowances for horses or farm animals on the site which can only happen in that district. Ms. Husak presented a zoning map showing the surrounding areas of Muirfield ranging from 1.6 to 1.9 units per acre.

Ms. Husak said a Commission discussion was being requested for this Informal Review by the applicant and Planning, and the following questions were suggested:

- 1) Does the proposal warrant a greater density than that outlined in the Community Plan, and if so, to what extent?
- 2) What other layout considerations should be made with this proposal?
- 3) What architectural character should the applicant strive for with this development?
- 4) What should the applicant consider when laying out the roadway and pathway system?

The applicant, William Adams, 6580 Cook Road, Powell, Ohio introduced Brian Kinzelman, their planner.

Brian Kinzelman, Landscape Architect and City Planner, MKSK, 462 Ludlow Alley, Columbus, explained that they had no preconceived notions as they first walked onto the site. He said that they decided to do a site analysis to understand the tree cover, topography, hydrology, and the surrounding neighborhood. He said the southwest branch of the watercourse was not shown on the analysis because it was rather insignificant to the extent that he did not even see it with the tall grass. He said as this project progresses, they will work further with Planning to protect any water corridors that need protected. Mr. Kinzelman said that his approach was to not disturb any more trees than they have to, not move more dirt than they have to, and cross the swale at its most advantageous location from the topography standpoint. He said working with the land, attempting to create reserves in the front yards what is largely two pods of housing, and use those possibly for stormwater management and reforestation of the site in the front yards, preserving the entire perimeter of the site as it is seen today, leaving all the trees and undergrowth, bolstering the tree perimeter to the extent possible with reforestation. He said he believed in touching as lightly as possible and not doing more manicuring than needs to be done.

Mr. Kinzelman said that regarding the rear yard easements that Planning mentioned, his notion is that they will restrict development, including mowing of those rear yard areas. He said they were proposing this to be an empty-nester market, with small ½-story to 2-story houses, and to bring them forward on the lots, preserving as much of the perimeter green space as possible, reforest that green space and take back some of the rear yards and cause them not to be developed.

Mr. Kinzelman said that Planning made a logical point about the need for livable outdoor space, and they understood that, but they did not look to have any development in the rear of those yards. He said they may sell these lots in fee, but they take the green space back to the surrounding neighbors, and also their community itself, they have that green space buffer.

Mr. Kinzelman said because this is a conceptual diagram, not a site plan, it does not show the whole notion of linkage to the community pathway system. He said they proposed that they would have sufficient interior linkage to all of their home sites, to their street corridor and to the pathway system to their perimeter. He said they were proposing to be a part of not only Muirfield Village, but of Dublin, and tie into that infrastructure system as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application. She requested the comments to be as close to point as possible because the Commission wanted to hear from everyone present. She explained that the Commission meetings are recorded and kept, and that each speaker should begin with their name and address so that it will be known who participated in the meeting.

Public Comments

Barry Boyles, 8890 Belisle Court, said in 1978, they purchased their lot because of the beautiful woods and peace and tranquility of the Buckner property. He said this project should not happen. He said 24 homes are over the top, and typical of developers' greed. Mr. Boyles said they realized someone would eventually develop the property, but this proposal is ridiculous. He suggested saving green space with maybe ten homes. He said this proposal would totally wipe out all green space in spite of what the computer-generated plan shows. He said cluster homes at \$650,000 are unbelievable when they cannot sell similar homes in Tartan Fields.

Mr. Boyles said were many other issues in Mr. Adams' development statement that were incorrect, but they need to focus on reasons to not change the density of this property. Mr. Boyles asked about the traffic flow of 40 to 50 vehicles on Springburn Drive, two to three times a day. He said school bus drivers occasionally have to ask residents to move cars so that they can get the buses through on Springburn Drive now. He said they have watched serious whitewater on this site, but the developer says that the creek has dried. Mr. Boyles suggested the Department of Natural Resources should analyze the water flow and the impacts on the surrounding area. He said three culs-de-sac from his home, when it rains, their backyards flood.

Mr. Boyles said this project will greatly affect their home values. He suggested if this property is going to be developed it be six to ten homes to save some of the last green space. He said Muirfield and Dublin will be a better place by saving some of the beautiful trees, flowers, and animal habitats. He suggested a similar project like was done with the Dublin Bait Store where money was spent for 31 acres, which turned out beautiful. He said he could not see why that could not happen on this site instead. Mr. Boyles said that the green spaces shown on the plan no longer exist. He said he proposed ten homes to keep the density where it was.

Warren Ashton, 8864 Belisle Court said his property was adjacent to this site. He said he selected his residence in Dublin 14 years ago because of the chance to invest in a place that had some stability. He said he asked his real estate agent what was the potential for this site and the agent assured him it was zoned low density and that Dublin had a zoning committee that really provided stability. Mr. Ashton said he would like the low density zoning to remain for the site.

Mr. Ashton said that a risk that could occur due to this proposal was to their quality of life. He said he felt that 24 homes were too many for what was being proposed. He encouraged the Commissioners to walk the dry creek. He said the tree roots were undercut and this year someone placed riprap along the creek due to the erosion just beyond the culvert under Cruden Bay. He said as a professional engineer, he believed the culvert was undersized for the runoff from building 24 homes and a road on the site. He said someone had constructed a wall with screening downstream. He said the culvert underneath Ayrshire Drive was enlarged about five years ago which he was confident was a waste of money because there were only two streams that fed it and this stream was one of them. He said that the possible flooding of neighboring homes needed to be considered.

Mr. Ashton said there is low land or a wetland on the site, and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources needed to evaluate the flooding and the effect on the environment if they change the creek. He said that some of the proposed lots actually span the creek. Mr. Ashton asked the Commission to really look and evaluate this proposed development.

Russ Randall, 8883 Belisle Court said they moved to their adjacent property 12 years ago. He said his children have enjoyed playing in the field and seeing the wildlife. He said they realized that this property would inevitably be sold and they factored in that it would be 6 to 12 homes, which was okay. He said he could not understand the rationale behind changing it from 12 to 24 homes, a low density to a high density, other than as the numbers it takes for certain profitability in purchasing this property for the developer to profit. He said they totally supported the landowner's right to sell this property and the right to sell to a developer within the current constraints or what it is zoned for, but with the limited open land that they have in Dublin, it was hard to understand how they are going to reverse it and take away some of that beauty. He said once developed, they cannot get it back. He referred to the bottom corner of plan and said that there was no way to avoid disrupting the view. He asked who would be the steward of the property or the interest of the Dublin community after the development begins when trees needed to be removed. He encouraged the Commission not to rezone this property. He said they had no problem if the developer wants to come back with the current zoning.

Linda Swearingen, 8881 Cruden Bay Court said that the creek ran beside them and often filled up high, although they were not in the floodplain. She said that she did not think this was the right place for a high density development. She said she was in the development business, and she had investigated the potential for this site before she purchased her property.

Gary Kaiser, 9015 Picardy Court said he lived downstream, north of this site. He said that his property was originally in the floodplain, but after the new culvert was put in, it was not in the floodplain. He said in June 1989, there was a floodplain study for Deer Run Creek which indicated that it was a very close margin where they are no longer in the floodplain. He said the EMH&T Engineers' study indicated an elevation in their backyard of 879.9 feet was the 100-year floodplain, and the elevation that would flood would be 880.0. Mr. Kaiser said they had no tolerance for a runoff in this area from 24 homes which would include new streets, rooftops, driveways, and patios all contributing to the runoff in this particular area. Mr. Kaiser said that he thought a lesser density would be appropriate, but as a homeowner who has a very short tolerance for flooding, he was very concerned about what was being proposed from the developer's point of view.

Pete Welsh, 8440 Gullane Court, a resident for 26 years, read into the record an August 6, 2012 letter addressed to the Commission from Britta Campton of 9184 Leith Drive that stated her concerns for the viability of the existing wildlife and wildflowers if this proposed high density zoned development came to fruition.

Gretchen Randall, 8883 Belisle Court said that her property is adjacent to the farm. She said her father, Roger Berlin, was one of the original builders of Muirfield Village. She asked that the density not be changed on this site. She said it was not possible to take a 3,200-square-foot footprint into a one-floor plan and not have every square inch of the property be covered. She said although a medium density is being proposed, the percentage of the area covered by actual structure then does become high density, and that was something that they really need to think about. Ms. Randall said they bought their house based on the low density, as many did. She said the environmental implications of this are huge. Ms. Randall said they were always told that the east end of the property would never be developable because of the watershed, the runoff, and the wetland. She said that the Commissioners needed to walk the site. She said she took offense to it being said that the creek is not a creek. She said it was humongous and unbelievable. She said it was torrential at times and except for the week or two they were out there. She said it almost always has water in it.

Ms. Randall pointed out on the plan the trees where the home footprints would have homes that cover the entire lot. She said there was no way the trees could stay and they would have to go. She said the reserve area will probably not survive the development process. She said she really took offense to what was an embellished picture where someone greened the area. She said it should in reality look like small twigs. She said her yard was embellished in the brochure to make it look greener for the developer's gain. She said that the proposed home price was ridiculous and unrealistic because at \$625,000 to \$650,000 per unit it is not doable and the market will not support it. She said one of four things will happen when the market does not support a price:

- 1) The development will take years to be done, in which case there will be constant noise and disruption to the neighborhood;
- 2) They will sit and get dilapidated, possibly be vandalized, and become an eyesore;
- 3) The price will have to come down in order to sell them which attracts a level of residents that is not consistent with the neighborhood; and
- 4) That the building is not able to make a go of it, and then the neighbors have a huge problem in their backyards and their property has been ruined for no reason.

Ms. Randall said she would like to see the park idea revisited. She said they had been told that the site was not going to become a park because of the price. She said the price is now half of what it was

several years ago. She said as Mr. Boyles mentioned, the city purchased the Bait Store and made a beautiful park out of it. She said her goal was to find out how to get the park idea revisited.

Greg Cunningham, 5801 Springburn Drive said he lives where McIntyre and Springburn Lane came together. He noted that the two accesses into Springburn Lane, which enters Drake Road and the extra traffic that will come through went straight into his house. He said he was concerned that there will be approximately 75 cars a day using the accesses and that had not been discussed. He said his main concern was the buffer zone. He said he purchased his home two years ago with the understanding this site was zoned low density and that it would be developed some day. He said if these 24 homes are built, they will not be anything special or different than can be found anywhere in Dublin. He said a 3,200-square-foot house on a 0.23-acre lot needs the buffer zone behind it because there would not be room for a yard. Mr. Cunningham said 50 percent of the trees in the buffer zone are problematic ash trees. Mr. Cunningham said that water from the farm flows into his backyard, so he knew the site was not dry.

Alesia Miller, 8445 Gullane Court said she had lived there for four years, and that her home was previously owned by Mr. Adams. She said she walked these paths every day. She presented a photograph of a redheaded woodpecker she saw recently on the site. She said it was one of the rare varieties of birds that will be lost if disturbed in any way. Ms. Miller said mammals depend on the waterway, and if it was not a good quality, they would not live there. She said the habitat was important.

Ms. Miller said the proposed development is going to create more flooding, cause the homeowners grief in the future, and take away the one small green space that they have. She suggested that if it cannot be a preserve if somehow it can be saved so that everyone can enjoy it that is not much to ask because that is all they have left of the past and she would like to see it left alone.

James Zitesman, 5701 Springburn Drive said his house backed up to the site. He said they moved in 18 years ago when there were horses. He said when he was a member of the Muirfield Civic Association, they discussed the property and called the City regarding options for the land. He said whether it is this project or any project it has to be balanced with the community and the desires of everyone with the use of the premises. Mr. Zitesman emphasized that it was neither the neighbors' nor his property, but the Buckner Estate's property, and they have a right if they can sell it, to do what they want with their property.

Mr. Ziteman said the use of the property will obviously be negotiated between all the interested parties. He said whether it is going to be this plan or a variation of this plan, there will no doubt be an impact, unless somehow it is bought by someone else who decides not to do anything with it. He said it was interesting to hear the sentiments of the community, but he did not agree with all of them. He said there is no right or wrong answer. Mr. Zitesman said this is a process of developing what may be the outcome in the end. He encouraged the community, the developer, the Commission, and the city to go through the process. He said he did not see the density that much different from what they saw on the chart of the surrounding areas. He said if one or two lots were lost, the density would be very similar to the density in his neighborhood. He said he appreciated this forum being an informal meeting, allowing the community to speak because it gave insights to everyone to all the issues involved. Mr. Zitesman encouraged everyone to keep a reasonable perspective and civil tone to have a good discussion, and perhaps a solution for this property will be found.

Peggy McDaniel, 6005 Springburn Drive said her home was at the corner where all the traffic turned into the site. She pointed out that Drake Road was a dirt road that was smaller than her driveway. She asked how the construction trucks would use the road. She said currently, on Carnoustie Drive there is a lot of traffic and this development will add to the problem. She said she did not want to see McMansions on small lots. Ms. McDaniel said her concerns were with the added traffic and lost green space.

Steve Bownas, 5975 Springburn Drive said he was worried that selling 3,200-square-foot homes on such small lots at \$650,000 would be difficult and would take a long time. He recommended that the applicant have good information about how much space there really is, how usable it would be, and how appealing he could make the product to work for him. He said he thought what worked best for the applicant might very well work better for the rest of them also.

Jack Burns, 9035 Picardy Court, said that he lived at the end of the stream where the Deer Run Creek intersected with this site. He said there has been a bridge across the stream since he moved there in 1986, and numerous times water from the 'dry' stream rose over the bridge. He said in 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, they had water in their home. He said what changed between 1986 and 1989 was that the Glick Road swimming pool was built. He said that was what parking lots and Phase 33 rooftops did to the small stream coming down the Deer Run to the inadequate culvert. He said he involved the Army Corps of Engineers and paid for his own flood study. Mr. Burns said that he had a 20-year-old video that showed the whole basin where this small stream came down. He confirmed that it was whitewater. He said he was worried about the safety of children. He said that Muirfield has rebuilt the bridge at least three times since 1986 because it was washed out. Mr. Burns said that the Commission needed to take a hard look at this proposal for the site.

Jeff Shanner, 5825 Springburn Drive, said that he lived at where the street began and the pool was on the left side. He said he understood that the stream issue was because of all the drainage from Muirfield. He said that how much runoff that came out of the drain directly under Springburn Drive needed to be determined before the Commission makes a decision on this development. He said when it rains hard, the drainage is at least two or three feet deep in his backyard. He said he also was concerned about the additional traffic. He said low density was fine at ten units per acre, or less. He reiterated that the water needed to be studied at the bottom and beginning of the stream.

Ms. Amorose Groomes explained that this was an informal hearing and that there had been no formal application for this project submitted to the city. She said that the developer said that he would like to pursue this kind of idea in this kind of area. She said the Commissioners are volunteers and residents of Dublin just like the neighbors. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that they were not city employees per se, and are not engineers. She said they sit on the Commission and try to think of what is best for this community as a whole.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said what will happen next is the Commission will have a discussion and provide feedback to the applicant. She said with the Commissioners' and neighbors' feedback the applicant will try to assemble what their strategy might be from that point. She said it may be nothing, pursuing a rezoning, or going with the existing zoning on the property. Ms. Amorose Groomes said given this is an individual property and there are property rights associated with that, they have the freewill to pursue what they feel is in their best interests. She said this is a very informal review and the Commission's feedback is not binding, nor is what the applicant says to the Commission binding.

Ms. Randall pointed out that they were told signs would be posted to announce this meeting, but the only sign they saw was on Drake Road, a dead-end gravel road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said unfortunately, legally signs cannot be placed on property that is not subject to the application and there are residential homes right to the right-of-way of the street. She said a notification sign can only be placed on the property itself.

Ms. Randall reiterated that Drake Road dead-ended so no one drove on it. She asked if it was possible to place a sign elsewhere.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that perhaps an adjacent resident would want the sign in their yard.

Ms. Husak said property owners within a certain distance of the property are notified by mail. She said that staff would mail public notifications to residents that provide their addresses. She said that the City website includes all active applications filed, and if this were to move forward, it would become a new application and would be posted on the City website as soon as it is processed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if anyone else in the audience wished to speak in regards to this case. [There was none.]

Victoria Newell said she would have some difficulty changing the density requirements to increase to what is proposed. She said the Commission did not have a lot of information in the meeting packet to make a good judgment on what might transpire with the development that is here. She said there are times that she thought high density could be done where a substantial amount of green space is preserved with that doing zero lot development or clustering the homes in very small clusters. Ms. Newell said she did not see that evolving out of what has been presented tonight. She said she thought it would disturb a lot of the older growth on the site that she thought would be better preserved. She said there is a point at which you start to take the shade and reduce that into the center of those growth areas that the mature trees will eventually die, even when a preserved area is left, they have grown up with each other and there is very little under branch growth within them.

Ms. Newell said there is nothing to delineate what this proposal is architecturally, and she thought if they ever got to a point where they will look at this property with more dense zoning on it, what would have to be here would have to be spectacular, and she did not see that in this initial presentation tonight.

Joe Budde, said he thought it behooved Mr. Adams and Mr. Kinzelman to take into consideration the comments that the neighbors have provided. He said he agreed that the density was too great as it has been presented and it was imperative that the appropriate study of the water flow and its impact on this property and the neighboring properties be undertaken to make sure that there is adequate drainage and that it does not affect the development to be developed and the neighbors that could be affected. Mr. Budde said he thought the architectural character should be in keeping with the surrounding development. He said the road width and the radii of all the turns are very important for emergency vehicles. He said existing heavy traffic on Springburn Lane made it difficult to turn into driveways. He said he thought less than half the number of building sites and not so much lot coverage would be better. He said he liked Ms. Newell's suggestion of doing that and maintaining the green space. Mr. Budde asked if anyone had contacted the Muirfield Association about acquiring the property to make it part of their green space.

Warren Fishman said the residents had made excellent points. He said when he flew over Muirfield Village and Dublin, he noticed when there is high density there is always open space around it. He said he was a Commissioner when the area developed around this site. He recalled a developer's comment that he would not live long enough to see the Buckner Farm developed. Mr. Fishman said he was not happy with the 1.9 units per acre density of these neighbors' home because he thought that was too dense. He said in the beginning, they tried to keep the density at 1.25 units per acre including the open space. Mr. Fishman said he agonized over this proposed development because he would like to see it less dense than 1.25 units per acre because the overall plan of the community around it is dense compared to the rest of Muirfield Village. He said he would never support a density over what was prescribed in the Community Plan. He suggested the density should even be lower. He said if spectacular housing not available in Dublin is built, perhaps the density could be higher, but he did not envision that.

Amy Kramb said to rezone this as a planned unit development she thought was the better and best option because it gives the Commission more control on the number of buildings and how they are laid out, as opposed to leaving it open, as a rural zoning. She said when residents comment that they do not want something rezoned, she likes to remind them that it provides much more control such as who will

control the trees that fall in the preserve areas and maintain the property. She said those controls can be placed in the PUD, but they are not available if the existing zoning remains. She said a PUD can state the number of units in the development. Ms. Kramb said she was for the PUD and as far as the number of units, it was how many lots can they fit on the site and still preserve the water and be able to have it flow the way it should, preserve as many mature trees, and lot coverage than necessarily a set number of houses. She said she would rather see something that has 20 to 30 percent lot coverage and not 80 percent lot coverage. She said 12 houses with 30 percent lot coverage is a lot better than 12 houses with 80 percent lot coverage.

Ms. Kramb said she was not yet ready to say how many the set number of houses is. She did not think as drawn, all the lots will fit as proposed with the stream. She said perhaps 16 to 18 houses would fit depending upon all the natural features and having to fit all the setbacks in, as part of the PUD, they can say where those preserved zones are and how much lot coverage there can be. She said if the current zoning states 15 to 11 houses, it might be okay, depending upon how they are arranged. She said if this came back to the Commission, she would want to see the reports of the stream and how many trees can be preserved, and other things the Commission always reviews. Ms. Kramb said the site will be developed and she thought PUD was the best option.

John Hardt said regarding the residents' comments wondering why this cannot become a park. He said that the Commission's only task with reacting to the proposal in front of them. He said that the Commission does not get to propose alternatives. He said specifically, the decision on whether to acquire and buy land is a decision that is made by City Council.

Mr. Hardt said the stormwater and drainage comments and concerns were completely valid as something that obviously needs to be addressed before this property can be developed. He said that any developer that wants to develop this property will have to hire a team of engineers who do this for a living and they will do remarkable calculations. He said after the work is done, it will be submitted to the city that has a group of talented engineers who review and check the calculations. He iterated that the stormwater and drainage issues were something that they need to keep their eyes on because they do not want to make them any worse.

Mr. Hardt said regarding tree preservation, he also is interested in the overall configuration of the proposal and making sure that as much green space and trees are preserved as can be. He said when he walked the site, he noted that many trees on the site are not great trees or are sick, dead, or dying. He said in other developments, it has been recognized that there are trees in Dublin that are better than others are. Mr. Hardt said that the applicant needs to submit a detailed tree survey early so that what trees are there can be identified. He said he would not want to revise the proposal in order to save trees and find out that it ends up being a worse plan because trees that were going to die anyway were saved.

Mr. Hardt said one of the things that the Commissioners are keenly aware of whenever they look at development is that they have to be very careful about unintended consequences. He said he always asked himself what would happen if they said 'No' to the development. He said one of the things that might very likely happen, is that someone would come along, and develop this site as a series of one-acre lots under the current regulations. He said if they did that, using similar lot coverage, it could end up being six to eight, 10,000-square-foot homes dropped on one-acre lots. He said in doing so, they would not have to devote any of the reserve or green spaces or no-disturb zones that are being proposed by this developer because they would not have to go through the PUD process that Ms. Kramb mentioned and they would not have to make those commitments. Mr. Hardt said at times, they have to be careful what they wish for and he agreed with Ms. Kramb that in some ways rezoning this property could be the best thing for everyone because it gives the opportunity to put controls and restrictions in place that are not there today. He said he could support a rezoning of this property and even lifting the density somewhat over what the Community Plan calls for to bring it into alignment with what exists around the site, but he would not support going above the density that surrounds the site.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said that the city always requires a tree study from any application, and this one would probably have to be a particularly detailed study, although typically we get the caliper, condition, and genus of the trees. She said if this application were to move forward, she would be very interested in reviewing the tree study. She said that one of the key standards that the Commission tends to hold developers to that come before them is that they cannot do more than what is in the neighborhood. She pointed out that the vast majority of this property is surrounded in two directions by a density of 1.6 units per acre. Ms. Amorose Grooms said she believed it was very reasonable for the residents of this area to think that whatever development would happen on this site would be subject to the same constrictions that they were subject. Ms. Amorose Grooms said she could not support anything over 1.6 units per acre, because that was what was a reasonable expectation in her opinion given by the neighborhood because that was the standard that they were held. She said she also was a Muirfield Village resident who walked this path with great frequency and she appreciates this beautiful property.

Ms. Amorose Grooms did however, want to keep in mind that the Buckner Estate did have rights because they own the property. She said they just needed to be held to the same standards that everyone else has been held to so that the playing field is level. She said she did not know that a \$200 per square-foot home is out of the realm of possibility for this site if the architecture, spaces, and finishes were great. Ms. Amorose Grooms said obviously, it has to be done very well and they have to be held to the same standards. She said she believed that they were likely to get families rather than empty nesters. She said she was really encouraged by seeing this quantity of residents come to something like this meeting who were passionate about their community. Ms. Amorose Grooms encouraged all of them to remain passionate about their community. She said she thought that was what made Dublin great and separated it from other communities.

Mr. Fishman said he it clear to the rest of the Commission that he agreed with Ms. Kramb in the way that he fervently agreed that it had to be a PUD because it would benefit everyone. He said the only way he disagreed was that he would like to see it no denser than it is now, but possibly less dense because when the Commission agreed to allow the density of 1.9 units per acre, it was a maximum density. He said the existing homes are sitting on the maximum density. He agreed that the development should be at least the standard of the existing homes, but because there is no real open space around those homes, he thought the Commission should pay very close attention to ensure that it is no denser, but maybe less to accomplish the open space. He said he also walked the site and saw many dead trees. He said it was not a lovely, healthy grove of trees. He reiterated that they should not even think about not having the site zoned PUD and should look at the density closely to make sure that it is at least the same density of the surrounding area, however he would like to see it less dense, using some imagination and making it something to be real proud of as the last piece in that area. He added that they should learn from the mistakes as he said with three-car garages. He agreed that there will most likely be families with children who will want yards than empty nesters. Mr. Fishman said that in Muirfield he had observed that people with small yards have a tendency to mow into the green space areas, their yards expand over the years, and the green space areas are lost. He reiterated that the density should be as low as possible to make the development something that Muirfield can be proud of having.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said a PUD would provide a great amount of protection to the surrounding properties in terms of architecture, lot coverage, and a number of things. She suggested if anyone was \interested in a better understanding of what benefits might come from the PUD, they should contact the Planning staff for more information. She explained that a PUD was not necessarily tied to density. She said it was a tool for development, not a prescription for development.

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited Mr. Adams to ask questions that would help him go forward.

Mr. Adams said his questions were for the benefit of the seller with whom he would be meeting tomorrow. He said the property was zoned as Rural in 1993, and he understood under a Rural zoning

format, 40,000-square-foot lots are required which would be approximately 12 lots on this property without deducting rights-of-way and that type of thing. He said he knew there had been other proposals that went wall-to-wall at a much higher density than what they were proposing. He said they supported the PUD process and obviously, that was the way it was being proposed to be able to provide the amount of open space that they have proposed, the flexibility in lot design, product type, and that sort of thing. Mr. Adams said that he understood that under the Rural zoning, if they prepared a plan or plat that complied with those zoning regulations, no presentation to the Commission was required and they would simply file a plat.

Ms. Husak said a plat would require a subdivision review and approval by the Commission and City Council.

Mr. Adams said also, rural zoning permits farming enterprises, which can be livestock or agricultural plantings. He asked if someone chose to go that route, were there restrictions as to how the property could be developed under that zoning. He asked if they were exempt from tree removal as a rural property that would be implied or restricted as a residential zoning change. He said there are many regulations that have to be complied with that people not in the business might not realize what they have to do. He said that a PUD is a text tool, but they have to go through tree preservation, tree, water quality, and runoff studies. He asked if someone developing a rural property would be exempt from that.

Gary Gunderman explained that if the property were divided into a rural subdivision, some of those restrictions in the platted arrangement and the single-family homes that he assumed would come with the plat would still apply. He said the City would not lose all that control on trees. However, he said if it was not platted and kept in a truly agricultural setting, a great deal of flexibility would be gained with the trees and things.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that Mr. Adams had all the information that he needed.

Mr. Adams thanked the neighbors for attending this informal review because they needed to hear their concerns. He said their comments were appreciated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested a sign-up sheet for notifications to be placed in the lobby. She thanked everyone for coming to the meeting for the review and discussion. She called a five-minute recess at 8:25 p.m. before starting the next case.

3. OhioHealth Campus, Subarea 2 – OhioHealth Urgent Care & Dublin Health Center
6905 and 6955 Hospital Drive
12-041Z/PDP/FDP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan
(Tabled 6 – 0 -Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan)

John Hardt recused himself from this case due to a conflict of interest.

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this rezoning/preliminary development plan and final development plan application requesting review and approval for modifications to the approved development text to permit a combination of wall and ground signs, directional signs to exceed size limitations, and off site directional signs for a portion of an existing medical office campus. She said the

application includes all final details including location, design, and materials of the proposed signs. She said the approximately 14.6-acre site is located between Hospital Drive, Dublin Methodist Lane and Avery-Muirfield Drive and encompasses Subarea 2 of the Dublin Medical Campus Planned Unit Development District. Ms. Amorose Groomes said this application contains two components and the Commission will need to make two motions and votes. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case including City representatives and OhioHealth representatives, James Lytle and Doug Scholl.

Claudia Husak explained that the rezoning/preliminary development plan focuses on the development text to make sure that the final development plan actually gets memorialized as part of the development text. She said the facility is covered under the Dublin Medical Campus text created specifically for the hospital which includes these parcels to the east of Hospital Drive, vacant parcels, and parcels divided by Dublin Methodist Lane. She said there are two buildings on the site, as well as a stormwater management facility. Ms. Husak said that the applicant came to Planning with more urgent needs for these two buildings and is not ready to look at this on a campus-wide scale. She said that they were trying to use the content of the existing development text written for the hospital, and mirror much of what was in place for the hospital in Subarea 2 and update the sign stipulations and regulations to address the needs of these two buildings, as well as some general wayfinding needs. She said that the Commission was reviewing proposed signs for Parcels A, B, and C.

Ms. Husak said that four types of signs are proposed in the development text, which are primary identification, primary directional, secondary directional, and other signs that meet Code; such as temporary, development, for lease and those types of signs. She said considering they are looking at sites that have a challenging topography developed with medical facilities that house several different medical uses within two buildings, as well as having a large medical campus being accessed through roadways around these buildings, the applicant is looking at the primary directional signs which would be ground signs that are taller than what typical directional signs would be. She said they are also permitted to be in a location that does not have a use on it, and also would be allowed to be off site, directing people across the entire medical campus and also allow four colors for the sign because the Emergency Room would be expected to be identified which is already in place in the existing development text. Ms. Husak said that the primary identification signs are geared toward tenants within the buildings themselves, and the applicant is proposing to allow a combination of wall and ground signs and having three per building. She said it is unique to have a combination of wall and ground signs, which is not typically permitted in the Zoning Code, but is definitely permitted on the hospital campus as of today.

Ms. Husak said for Property A, which includes the OhioHealth Urgent Care, a 9-foot tall primary identification sign is proposed. She said all the facilities are being operated under the OhioHealth umbrella, so all the signs proposed have the common OhioHealth element on top of the sign cap. She said proposed are wall signs for the Urgent Care along the Avery-Muirfield Drive frontage, which meets the Zoning Code and the development text for height and size, and a small sign by the entrance door. She said the three proposed primary identification signs for Property A are permitted in the proposed development text.

Ms. Husak said for Property B, the applicant has requested Administrative Approval to reface the existing 11-foot tall sign located by the pond. She said the Commission was not being asked to take action on the request, but the information was being shared so that they had the complete sign information for the property.

Ms. Kramb noted that the existing sign was 11-foot tall and the text said it could be 10-feet tall and that it would not conform.

Ms. Husak explained that the re-facing of the non-conforming sign could be Administratively Approved, but if it was relocated or removed, another sign in that location could not be approved at that height.

Ms. Husak said two primary identification wall signs on Property B proposed focus on the building entrances for a sports medicine facility and the Ohio Dublin Health Center. She said there might be different physicians within the building or having access through the building, but basically using the health center name to guide people to their destination. She said also proposed is a six-foot tall secondary directional ground sign to guide people from Hospital Drive to arrive at the OhioHealth Dublin Health Center.

Ms. Husak said the existing development text permits off site directional signs that are intended to be campus-wide, using words like '*at key intersections*' to make sure that the signs are located within areas where people come off the highway or a major road, needing to know where they need to go quickly. She said proposed is an 11-foot tall primary directional ground sign with the 'Emergency Room' identifier on it, off Dublin Methodist Lane, coming down from Avery-Muirfield Drive or primarily the highway. She said the applicant provided a visibility triangle for the sign to make sure that it does not impede vehicular traffic due to its location at an intersection.

Ms. Husak said the recommended conditions center around landscaping for the base of the signs, which the Code requires, but that is not part of this application which will have to be done as part of the sign permit process as well as identifying any kind of easements that the signs may be located within, and if so, they just have to follow the process for easement encroachment and Engineering will have to make sure that is included as part of the conditions.

Ms. Husak said that Planning is recommending approval of both application components with two motions. She explained that the Preliminary Development Plan would then go to City Council and the Final would pend, based on the preliminary approval by City Council. She said that Planning recommends approval for the rezoning and approval with two conditions of the Final Development Plan:

- 1) That the applicant include easement information, and if necessary an easement encroachment form and fee with the sign permit application; and
- 2) That the applicant provide a landscape plan for each ground sign at the sign permit stage to demonstrate that each sign base is landscaped in accordance with the Zoning Code.

James Lytle, representing the applicant, OhioHealth, said he had been hired to solve a primary problem with the Dublin Methodist Hospital, which was wayfinding for their two facilities, specifically for Urgent Care. He said because of the geographic arrangement of this site and the fact that these buildings sit back off of Avery-Muirfield Drive a considerable distance, they are trying to signal to drivers on the main thoroughfare that they are, by address numbers, specifically the buildings they are trying to reach as their destination. He said in addition, putting 'Urgent Care' on the side of the building will make it easy for patients and visitors to find it without having to wander and get lost in the area. He said they are trying to replicate the current standards for the signs on the campus to create the dynamic of being a very consistent application of the signs themselves.

Mr. Lytle said on Property A, they have a hardship with a substantial utility box located on the road that blocks the view at a standard height of the sign coming from the hospital going back towards the Perimeter Loop Drive and Avery Road intersection, and so they are proposing to increase the height of the sign to nine feet.

Mr. Lytle said the Health Center is a one-story building and there was no place to place a large street number on the side facing Avery Road, so they are proposing to exchange the existing 'Dublin Health Center' text with the Hospital Drive street number.

Mr. Lytle said on the Dublin Health Center building, a separate entrance is being made for what is now referred to as 'Max Sports Medicine' and consequently, they will not be entering through the main door as

tenants have done in the past. He said they are trying to isolate that as a separate entrance, primarily because they have different hours. He said they are going to address those as two separate entrances and that they are amending the text to allow for that.

Mr. Lytle said the directional sign proposed will probably be the most important or critical directional sign for the entire Dublin Methodist Hospital Campus because now that there is Dublin Methodist Lane, where many visitors are going down to get to the campus, is going to be right there as their first decision point, and that will tell them to go across the street over into the main Subarea 1 to the hospital, medical office building, and emergency room, and also be able to tell them that they need to turn right to go to these two buildings that have been orphaned over the years.

Mr. Lytle reiterated they were trying to help people find these sites and also maintain the integrity and standards of the campus. He said he expected they would be back, asking for more sign allowances and permits for the remainder of the property that has not been developed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment regarding this case. [There was none.]

Amy Kramb said she was okay with the proposed primary 12-foot sign, but she did not want to see another 12-foot sign on the west side of that intersection so that there would be one on all four corners on the intersection. She said the text allows two secondary ground signs, which can be half the size, six-foot tall, per building, so that has four more signs, and they are using one of them now in this plan. She said it seemed like they just ran out of primary identification signs because they are only allowed three and so they called this one a secondary directional sign. She pointed out that D-2 was along the road, the same as A-2 which is called a primary identification sign and this one is a secondary directional sign. Ms. Kramb said that allowing two signs per building was excessive and she could not see how that many more directional signs were needed. She said they have two entrances into the building, so she thought two signs for this subarea would be fine, but not four signs. She said by the time she added all the signs permitted, there could be ten signs. She said she knew that not all of the signs were being proposed, but she thought some of them needed to be stricken from the text.

Richard Taylor said when he drove Avery-Muirfield Drive to Hospital Drive, as soon as he got to the entrance, including the sign to the hospital; he counted 11 signs that indicated Dublin Methodist Hospital. He said even the directional signs say Dublin Methodist Hospital at the top of the sign. He said the hospital was hard to miss. Mr. Taylor's biggest concern was Paragraph G that is proposed to be stricken in the development text because it seemed to him that there was a good reason to have it, and it seemed pretty forceful and definitive to him that this was originally conceived and is intended to remain as a single graphic standard to apply to this entire campus. He said that he did not see a compelling reason to change that. He said there is no question that there is a wayfinding issue, but he did not think that there was a compelling issue to add all these signs, and he did not think this was the solution. He said whatever the solution ends up being; it needed to be one that incorporates whatever is going on at the hospital and any other undeveloped subareas that we have a consistent overall plan for this whole area. He said otherwise, we end up where we are headed right now which is a ton of signs in Subarea 1 and 2, and no relationship between the two in terms of controlling the number and the size of those.

Mr. Taylor said regarding the Urgent Care, he understood that people needed to see that, but there are other urgent cares in the area and this is an unfair competition with other urgent care businesses in the area. He said he agreed that there was a wayfinding issue here, but there was a sign that said Hospital, an 'H' sign, an 'H' on the building, and there was a sign on the building that said Dublin Methodist Hospital. He said on the main entrance, there are two planting walls, that each say 'Dublin Hospital' and there are two directional signs saying 'Dublin Hospital'. He said that he thought it was over signed now. He said he could not support dividing this or the individual sign changes proposed for now.

Warren Fishman said he agreed with Mr. Taylor and Ms. Kramb. He commented that at Riverside Hospital, they had so many signs that when trying to find something, it was incredibly confusing. He said Riverside Hospital was over signed. He said he thought they were doing much better with signs at Dublin Hospital. He suggested it might help wayfinding if the wording on the existing signs could be changed. He agreed that the applicant should look at the whole campus and make sure it is attractive.

Joe Budde said that he thought the applicant was faced with an immense problem given where this is located and what the need is. He said for what the problem is, he complimented what was presented by Mr. Lytle because graphically, it was appealing and simple. He said there needed to be a solution if people cannot find the urgent care facility. Mr. Budde said he thought it was a very good solution to the problem that they are faced with and if they could keep things consistent with other parts of the development in the future, when they come for those signs, the Commission will have the opportunity for that at that point in time. Mr. Budde said to hold this up and require them to come back with a more comprehensive plan for the rest of the area when they have only asked for this, and he thought the Commission had the responsibility to act on it. He said he thought this was a good solution and an attractive set of graphics has been presented which he would support.

Victoria Newell asked what were the exact addresses for the two buildings and to what street they applied.

Mr. Lytle said that the addresses were 6905 and 6955 Hospital Drive.

Ms. Newell said having the address signage and the Urgent Care identification sign along Avery-Muirfield Drive would create more confusion than benefiting anyone finding the buildings, and equally confusion to all the other addresses because they take so much permanence along Avery-Muirfield Drive, and no one can access those buildings from Avery-Muirfield Drive at the locations being distinguished there. She said she agreed that too much signage was being proposed not fully providing a solution. She said she thought the signs designed and the Ohio Health logos are attractive. However, she thought this could be condensed and it would serve the purpose better for what has been presented to the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought hospitals by nature are difficult to navigate. She said St. Ann's and Mt. Carmel East and West hospitals all are difficult to navigate and to figure out where it is that you are trying to go. She said she was not completely convinced that this solves the problems. She said she agreed with Ms. Newell about putting an address on Avery-Muirfield Drive with a number on it. She said when someone is looking for another business on that street that has an address number much larger, it would provide misinformation. She said although Mr. Lytle did not name the buildings he was hired to design signs for, there are many redundancies. She said she did not want to cause a delay and she realized that this was difficult to navigate due to the unusual roadway network, confusing by nature, and then added Dublin Methodist Lane which further confused things. She said it aided getting ambulances in quickly but it muddled the water in terms of where you were going because now you were looking in different directions at the same time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it seemed like with the nomenclature and the placement of the signs, they may be creating as many problems as they are solving. She said she did not think this was the right answer.

Mr. Lytle said the biggest issue was that hospital campus property has a challenging topography. He said before Dublin Methodist Lane was constructed there was only one way to get there. He said at the intersection there is a blue 'H' on the cross member and also an ODOT sign in the median. He said they were not trying to get people to Dublin Methodist Hospital, but to OhioHealth Urgent Care or OhioHealth Primary Care Physicians. Mr. Lytle said they were trying to address how they get people to that campus. He explained that was why they tried to do the address numbers of the business on the building on Avery Road. He said one of the problems they had was how to direct people to that building. He said how the

signs are created to get those people to that campus is really their biggest problem to solve. He said it was an urban type environment, so you have to know your way back to the campus. He said they were trying to direct people that come from US 33 that do not have a clue how to get there. Mr. Lytle said that patients do not want to go to the emergency room because they can go to urgent care for less expense. He said they were trying to figure out if the campus needed some kind of entry point like a gateway so that people can be funneled to this campus.

Mr. Lytle said health care and airports are the two most critical navigational places that you can go to try to communicate information to people that are stressed, in a hurry, or are not paying attention. He said consequently, even though there are a lot of signs, you reassure people that they are heading in the right direction and that is why it is so critical to have those signs on the site. He said if there were only one or two signs, he would guarantee that there would be a lot of people lost, driving around the campus trying to find their destination.

Mr. Lytle said that he and Ms. Husak had tried to incorporate standards for the entire campus itself and obviously, they will be back for signs needed for Subarea 1 as that property continues to develop. He said both buildings will be opening soon, so they are trying to take care of the immediate needs of those tenants. He said other than just having a sign on Hospital Drive and hope that patients find their way, a solution is to go to the other side of the building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if other than for urgent care, most people coming to these destinations were appointment driven.

Mr. Lytle said they had appointments and received location instructions.

Ms. Kramb said she had experienced difficulty following the directions provided to Max Sports. She said she had no problem with raising the height of the existing sign obscured by the utility box or moving it to the north end of the parcel so it could be seen when driving around the corner.

Mr. Lytle said that they had discussed moving the sign, but the issue of putting the sign off site on someone else's property was an issue.

Ms. Kramb said although it was not near the entrance drive, locating the sign on the north property line would make it so that it could be seen.

Mr. Lytle said he thought that was a good idea.

Ms. Kramb suggested that instead of a sign above the door, a sticker on the door would suffice because it is a destination.

Mr. Lytle said in the future, OhioHealth was rebranding, so everything now known as OhioHealth more so than it would be Dublin Methodist Hospital, will be OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital. He said that MaxSports may change to OhioHealth Sports Medicine.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that it seemed in the appointment driven facilities the address should be more prominent and helpful. She said however, they wanted to facilitate how to get to the Urgent Care and Emergency.

Mr. Lytle asked if the Commission would entertain the idea of taking the Urgent Care sign on Avery Road side and moving it to the Hospital Drive side of the building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that it was not the Urgent Care part of the sign, but the street number that is causing confusion for the balance of the population.

Victoria Newell said she was very concerned about leaving the Urgent Care sign on the Avery-Muirfield side of the building because it primarily distinguishes the building you are going to, but you will be right in front of the building and still not be at the entrance because you have already passed one entrance to get to that point and you are going to continue farther past that. She said she was envisioning a situation where someone having a heart attack showed up there when they really needed to go to the hospital in the first place. She said locating the sign there when someone is under duress may cause them to go somewhere they should not drive, especially at night, or when the Urgent Care was closed.

Ms. Kramb said that she thought the west side of the building was the better side.

Mr. Lytle said that OhioHealth does not own the buildings, so they are subjected to what their landlord, says they can and cannot do. He said if they can move it to that side of the building that would be better.

Mr. Taylor said he agreed that signage was needed to locate the building but not necessarily the tenants, and in the parking lot, it could tell you where each tenant was located. He said that a concept such as Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested would simplify the whole thing. He said he did not know that the numbers on the Avery-Muirfield Drive side did anything but make it worse. Mr. Taylor said they are trying to get people to Hospital Drive first and then to the address. He said there are only two buildings and two numbers. He said the hospital to the right is a giant building.

Mr. Taylor said he understood the importance of urgent care, but there are still office buildings, and it is still a private business. He said that the emergency room was a special case, but he did not think urgent care is a special case in that same way that gets extra advertising.

Mr. Fishman said he did not think more signs were needed. He said that more signs were more confusing.

Doug Scholl, OhioHealth, said that he was part of the Riverside Hospital addition project and they are discussing what the future sign plan should be. He said the issue here was different because they are really a campus separated by a road. He said the question of Subarea 1 and 2 is how to divide the outpatient services and separate them from the hospital. He said the urgent care question is an interesting one because they talked about it kind of opposite of how it really happened. Mr. Scholl said that many people go to the emergency room before they go to urgent care because they do not know where the urgent care is located. He said that identification is critical more than the number because if someone is confused, in a hurry, and stressed, they are going to go to the first place they can find to get help. He said the critical point is in trying to separate the outpatient services from the hospital services, not as they are trying to link it under one brand, but to be able to separate the wayfinding. He said the use of the sign in the corner of the lot is to try to help sort for people coming down Dublin Methodist Lane to Hospital Drive, which things are the outpatient things they need to turn right for and which are the hospital things for which they need to go straight. Mr. Scholl said it was a sorting of people at the first opportunity to help them find what they need.

Ms. Kramb said she was okay with the sign for Property C as long as there is not one on every corner. She said she thought they needed just one other simple address sign at each entrance for the other two buildings. She said she was okay with the name above the entrance door too. She said she thought they just got too complicated.

Mr. Scholl said he thought that was a little bit of trying to work within the zoning text and create pockets for things to go in has made it more complicated than simplifying.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that the address said '6905 OhioHealth Urgent Care and Medical Offices'. She said it already said 'OhioHealth' at the top of the sign, but if they really wanted to get people to the urgent care, it should say '6905 Urgent Care' or just 'Urgent Care.' Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Property C sign said 'OhioHealth' at the top, then 'Emergency' and tells you where the hospital is, and where the medical offices are located. She asked if Urgent Care is the concern, why is it at the bottom of the sign and why is it cluttered between 'OhioHealth Urgent Care and Medical Offices 6005'.

Mr. Scholl agreed that was a good point.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that as you approach from the north, the '6905 Urgent Care' sign is the first sign you see on the entire campus, so if you come from Avery-Muirfield Drive onto Hospital Drive, you are there. He said he agreed that the sign should be moved.

Ms. Krumb said if you are coming down Hospital Drive and the sign is sitting where the letter 'C' is on the plan, you have already passed the sign that says 'Urgent Care,' so you have to turn around and go back.

Mr. Taylor clarified that he was talking about the sign they propose to raise. He said that sign A-2 was in the right place, it was the first sign seen, and it says '6905 Urgent Care' at the top. He said that and the small blue 'Urgent Care' sign does the job.

Mr. Lytle said that was another issue that they were trying to address. He said the signs that were erected give you so many lines to put what you need on them. He said their options are to increase the size of the sign to allow more messages for urgent care and that type of thing. He said they are locked into those existing signs unless they want to change them out and turn them into larger signs as shown on C-1 where there is the opportunity to add more destinations on those signs.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to pick the destinations. She suggested trying to absorb as he was driving a vehicle what all this information is and get to the point and tell them what they need to know. She said people that are not sick will find their way.

Ms. Newell said she was okay with the signs proposed for Property 'C' but not okay with the additional 'Urgent Care' sign and the additional building numbers that are not on Avery-Muirfield Drive. She said she thought that was creating confusion and was unnecessary to get you where you need to go if other directional signs associated with it are provided. She said she agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes about placing a higher priority on the Urgent Care sign based on the presentation provided tonight.

Ms. Amorose Groomes explained the Commission could vote on this application or table it so that it could come back, maybe incorporating some of the feedback received or with further research that would help the wayfinding system to the next meeting waiving the time limit requirements. She asked Mr. Lytle what they would like the Commission to do with this application.

Mr. Lytle said they had worked out with Ms. Husak a wraparound for the existing A-2 sign at the lower height. He asked if they could put up a temporary sign to help navigation for the folks opening up their brand new business.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were applications for temporary signs.

Ms. Husak indicated that if an applicant trying to work through issues with Planning and has an active application open, Planning will work with them.

Mr. Lytle said that would help them solve their immediate problem that they have with their tenants.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission would certainly want to help solve that issue and temporary permits could be issued.

Mr. Lytle said they would like a tabling of this application. He said they would work with Ms. Husak to see what they can work out on a temporary basis.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to table this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan application as requested by the applicant. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 6 – 0.)

4. Community Plan 2012 Amendment 12-046ADM (Presentation)

Administrative Request

[John Hardt rejoined the meeting for this presentation.]

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request for a review of draft modifications to objectives and strategies in the 2007 Community Plan as part of the 2012 Community Plan Amendment process.

Mr. Goodwin explained that staff from various City departments has been reviewing all aspects of the Community Plan including all the objectives and strategy statements in the Plan. He estimated that there were over 300 statements. He said the proposed amendments ran the gambit from minor text changes for wording consistency to revising wording just to improve the clarity of what the policy intent is. He said in other cases, they were trying to recognize recent planning initiatives that the city has undertaken in the past five years; most notably, the Bridge Street and the Innovation District planning initiatives and the associated zoning requirements which impact a number of objectives and strategies throughout the document.

Mr. Goodwin said in some cases, they want to recognize that specifically with Bridge Street, the city has decided to do something very different for that part of the city, and we need to clarify that some new types of planning approaches are appropriate there, but maybe not in other portions of the city. He said for example, mixed use development, is obviously a key to Bridge Street and we already had some strategies in Chapter 3 that recommended incorporating mixed use development in targeted areas throughout the city that is reflected on our Land Use Plan and now, Bridge Street takes that to a whole new level. He said that does not mean that mixed use development is not appropriate still in other portions of the city, but it is not going to be the same type of development that we see happening on Bridge Street. Mr. Goodwin said we want to see context sensitive mixed use development in certain areas. He said that was one example of what does this new big planning initiative for Bridge Street mean for some of these other larger city policies.

Mr. Goodwin summarized and explained the reasoning behind the proposed draft modifications to the objectives and strategies in each of the ten chapters of the Community Plan. He said that Planning recommends that the Commission discuss the proposed changes and policy additions and provide feedback to staff for further revision. He said no formal recommendation is requested at this time. He said a final draft of the proposed amendments, along with additional supplemental text within each chapter of the Community Plan will be brought back to the Commission for a future recommendation.

Ms. Kramb said that in many places the 'Bridge Street Corridor' is called out and in others, it is 'Bridge Street and West Innovation' or 'Innovation' without the word 'West'. She said it was confusing as to why just the Bridge Street was being called out in some cases.

Mr. Goodwin said that was something that he was aware of as they were putting this presentation together. He said there were still consistency issues, but there may be areas where it was appropriate to single out one or the other.

Ms. Kramb said there were times where the Tech Flex and Innovation also applied but were not mentioned. She said 90 percent of the references were just to Bridge Street and Tech Flex perhaps two percent of the time and the other part was West Innovation. She asked if 'Innovation' was different from 'West Innovation', or the same.

Mr. Goodwin said that they were the same.

Joe Budde referred to the Fiscal Analysis chapter. He said he had read recently that there were discussions about suburbs sharing some services and the state systematizing and taking over the collection of income taxes and things of that nature. He asked if that was included or at least mentioned.

Mr. Goodwin said that they had not discussed that with the Finance department.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any public comments related to this discussion. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were other comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:24 p.m.

As approved and amended by the Planning and Zoning Commission at the September 6, 2012 meeting.